

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 74, 76-81 and 83-93 remain pending in the application. Claims 74, 76, 81 and 83 are independent claims. By the foregoing amendment, claims 74, 76, 78, 80, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92 and 93 are amended.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 80, 87, 90 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has asserted that the referrer field contains "the information concerning the referrer." Nevertheless, notwithstanding the Examiner's assertion, a custom store I.D. can be based on the asserted information concerning the referrer. For example, Applicants have disclosed that the custom store application can check the referrer field of the HTTP header for the custom store I.D. Specifically, the correct referrer field value can be the secure user page 122. As disclosed, a custom store application for a custom store 124 checks the referrer field of an HTTP header before allowing a display of the custom store data 124. Thus, only the members of a group can be allowed access to the custom store page. Accordingly, claims 80, 87, 90 and 93 are amended to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, independent claims 74 and 81, including various dependent claims, stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383 (Henson). On pages 7-10 of the Office Action, independent claims 76 and 83, along with various dependent claims, stand rejected as being unpatentable over the Henson patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,373 (Blinn et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed a method and system for presenting customized information at an electronic commerce site. As exemplified in Fig. 4, a customer can enter a home page 120 of an institution, go to a secure mode 122, and go to a custom store page 124. The custom store application checks the referrer header field of the HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) header that indicates the URL of the location from which a URL request is sent. Alternately, some portion of the entire URL, such as the host name, could be used.

Applicants have further disclosed that the custom store application for the custom store 124 checks the referrer field of the HTTP header before allowing a display of the custom store data 124. The URL for the customer store includes a custom store I.D. The referrer field of the HTTP header can be checked for the custom store I.D. As exemplified in Fig. 5, a data structure for the custom store in block 130 can include, e.g., a customer number, a database I.D., a referrer URL field, and a store type I.D. Each different store type I.D. can be used to set up a different type of custom store.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by independent claims 74, 76, 81 and 83. For example, the independent claims variously recite, among other features, a custom store application that executes on a computer and that examines a referrer header field in an HTTP request for access to said electronic commerce site to determine whether said referrer field indicates that said request originated from a predetermined host, and for generating and returning a custom store page based upon said configuration data in response to said request for access, if the referrer field indicates that the request originated from said predetermined host, wherein said custom store application selects configuration data that is associated

with said predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page, as recited in claim 74.

In setting forth the rejection, the Office Action states that the Henson patent discloses that a custom store application makes a determination that a request for access originated from a predetermined host "by examining embedded identifiers in an HTTP header", with reference to column 14, lines 19-61. It is respectfully submitted that the cited passage from the Henson patent does not support this statement, as set forth in previous arguments of record. Further, the Henson patent would not have taught or suggested, among other previously argued features, examining a referrer header field in an HTTP request for access to an electronic commerce site to determine whether said referrer field indicates that a request originated from a predetermined host, and for generating and returning a custom store page based upon said configuration data in response to said request for access, if the referrer field indicates that the request originated from said predetermined host, wherein said custom store application selects configuration data that is associated with said predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page, as recited in claim 74. Rather, the patent merely discloses that a customer is recognized as being in a particular customer group based upon the link used to access the online store (col. 14, lines 39-41). Accordingly, the Henson patent would not have taught or suggested at least the recited feature of a custom store application selecting configuration data that is associated with a predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page, as recited in claim 74, and as similarly recited in claims 76, 81 and 83.

More generally, the Henson patent discloses that, upon recognition of the group to which a particular customer belongs, the online store only presents those choices that are appropriate for that group of customers. (Column 13, lines 30-37). With respect to the ability to recognize who a customer is, the patent states "a customer is identified as being in a particular customer set according to what link the customer executed to get to the online store." (Column 14, lines 19-21, emphasis added). The patent goes on to describe an example in which a particular type of customer, i.e. a federal government customer, is clicking through the pages of an online vendor. A link is embedded in at least one of those pages that enables the customer to proceed to the federal site. If the customer accesses that link, the online store then acts to treat the customer as a federal customer. That patent states "The general model is that if you can get to a page that has a link to the store in it, then a customer is recognized as being in a particular customer group based upon the link used to access the online store." (Column 14, lines 38-41). But one cannot possibly surmise from the Henson patent the claimed feature of a custom store application selecting configuration data that is associated with a predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page, as recited in claim 74, and as similarly recited in claims 76, 81 and 83. The Henson patent is simply devoid of any teaching or suggestion that a custom store page can be selectively configured based upon the predetermined host from which a request originates.

Applicants have previously argued of record that the Henson patent simply does not disclose HTTP headers being examined. Rather, the Henson patent discloses that, by clicking on a link that directs the user to a particular site, or page, the user is identified as belonging to the group associated with that site, or page.

Accordingly, the Henson patent as disclosed cannot possibly have the web site selectively configure its web page based upon its reading of a referrer header field in an HTTP request, as recited in independent claims 74 and 81.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 74 and 81, as well as their dependent claims, are respectfully requested.

Claim 76 recites a system for presenting customized information having a database that stores information relating to products, an administrative application that enables an administrator to define a custom store, and a custom store application that presents the custom store in response to certain requests. The claim further recites a reconciliation application that determines whether said configuration data includes information relating to products that are no longer available from said vendor, and provides notification to the administrator if such information is included in the configuration data, wherein said custom store application selects configuration data that is associated with a predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page. In such a case, the reconciliation application provides a notification to the administrator and said custom store application selects configuration data that is associated with a predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page. Claim 83 recites analogous subject matter.

The rejection of claim 83 (as in claim 76) explicitly acknowledges that the Henson patent does not disclose that product information specifically refers to products that are no longer offered by said vendor.

The Blinn et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Henson patent. The Blinn et al. patent discloses obtaining an order 124 and deleting items

designated for deletion to ensure that subsequent components will not process any deleted items (co. 22, line 66 through col. 23, line 4). But this citation by the Examiner would not have taught or suggested a reconciliation application that determines whether said configuration data includes information relating to products that are no longer available from said vendor, and provides notification to the administrator if such information is included in the configuration data, as recited in claim 76, and as similarly recited in claim 83. Likewise, the he Blinn et al. patent would not have taught or suggested said custom store application selects configuration data that is associated with a predetermined host to generate and return said custom store page, as recited in claim 76, and as similarly recited in claims 74, 81 and 83.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 76 and 83, as well as their dependent claims, are respectfully requested.


For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 15, 2007

By:


Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620